

**SECRET**

30 October 1950

MEMORANDUM

TO: General Counsel  
FROM: Finance Division  
SUBJ: Public Law 830 - 81st Congress

1. Paragraph (a) of Public Law 830 amends P. L. 600 by striking out "in the order directing the travel" and substituting "or approved". We interpret this as meaning that whereas heretofore it was necessary that all elements of legal travel such as transportation of household goods and effects and dependents could not be paid unless authorized in advance, they can now be paid if retroactively approved by proper authority. Is this interpretation correct?

2. Paragraph (b) of Public Law 803 amends subsection (a) of PL 600. Apparently this amendment is made to enable employees stationed at a point in the United States to get paid for movement of families and effects from actual place of residence, although it may be different from their stations, and allow the same type of privileges now authorized for new appointees in connection with the movement of their dependents and effects. Is this interpretation correct?

3. Paragraph (c) of Public Law 830 amends PL 600 to permit evacuation of families and effects from danger zones. It appears that the authority here given parallels that already contained in foreign service regulation. Is this interpretation correct?

4. Section 2 of Public Law 830 amends Section 7 of PL 600 and modifies the language concerning payment by the individual of travel expenses from the post in the event of breach of contract before he has served his full tour of duty. It provides further that:

".... expenses of return travel and transportation upon separation from the service shall be allowed whether such separation is for the purposes of the Government or for personal convenience, but shall not be allowed unless such persons selected for appointment outside the continental United States shall have served for a minimum period of not less than one nor more than three years prescribed in advance

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

by the head of the department or agency concerned or unless separation is for reasons beyond the control of the individual and acceptable to the department or agency concerned."

It is not clear as to the practical implications and significance as related to CIA employees of the modification of language [in the first part of the amendment] to Section 7, and the specific language quoted above. Should this section be interpreted to mean that:

- (a) Employees have a legal right to resign and return to the United States at government expense after one year of duty, even though the contract specifies a two-year tour of duty.  
*OR*
- (b) Employees may be required to serve the tour of duty specified in their contracts and may be required to refund the cost of return transportation if they resign before the end of their scheduled tour, [but that the agency, may at its discretion, determine that the cost of return travel is chargeable to official expense and not require the individual to bear the cost as a personal expense?

5. Would you also advise if Sections 8 and 9 have any special significance or application to funds made available to CIA.

6. Your advise on the above points would be appreciated.

25X1

Chief, C & L Branch  
Finance Division

**SECRET**